IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P(C) No. 2628 of 2025

Saraswati Devi, w/o- Premchand Mahto,
R/o Village- Jaridih Basti, P.O.- Jaridih Bazar, P.S.- Gandhi Nagar, District- Bokaro

....Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. The Chairman- cum- Managing Director, Central Coalfields Limited, Darbhanga House, P.O.- Darbhanga House, P.S.- Kotwali, District- Ranchi
2. The Project Officer, AKKOCP Project, B & K Area, Central Coalfields Limited, Kargail Bazar, P.O. & P.S- Phusro, Bokaro
3. The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro, P.O. & P.S.- Bokaro, District -Bokaro
4. The Additional Collector, Bokaro, P.O. &P.S.-Bokaro, District- Bokaro
5. The Circle Officer, Bermo, P.O. & P.S.- Bermo, District- Bokaro

… Respondent(s).

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Abhishek Sriwastava, Advocate
For the State : Mr. P.C Sinha, AC to GA-III
: Mr. R.K. Roy, AC to GA-III
For Resp-CCL : Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate
: Mr. Sharan Toppo, Advocate

……..

03/21.07.2026: Heard, learned counsel for the parties.

2. By way of filing this writ petition, the petitioner has sought for the following reliefs:-

> *i. For a direction upon the respondent authorities to pay the monetary compensation of Rs. 14,65,09,666/- (Fourteen Crores Sixty Five Lakhs Nine Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Six) against the land of the family of the petitioner under Mauza—Bermo, Khata No.- 132, Plot No.- 221, having an area of 2 acres acquired by C.C.L. in the year 2017.*
> *ii. Further, for a direction upon the respondent authorities to pay statutory interest on the amount of monetary compensation since the time of acquisition of the land of the petitioner till the date the said payment is made to the petitioner as the land of the petitioner was acquired in the year 2017 but till date not a single penny has been paid by the respondent authorities to the petitioner.*

3. The fact of the case is that the petitioner's ancestral land measuring area 5.90 acres under Khata No. 132, Plot No. 221, Mauza Bermo, standing in the name of her father-in-law, Mahanand Mahto,

was acquired by Central Coalfields Limited (CCL) for the Konar Project. Vide order dated 16.03.2016, the Circle Officer, Bermo, recognized 2 acres as raiyati land, on the basis of which the petitioner's son was provided employment in CCL. The petitioner claims that although compensation of Rs.14,65,09,666/- was sanctioned by office order dated 26.08.2017 for the acquired land, no amount has been paid despite the lapse of more than seven years.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although petitioner’s son was given employment under the rehabilitation scheme, she has not received any compensation for the acquired land. Counsel further submits that despite submitting several representations to the Project Officer, CCL, the Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro, and the CMD, CCL, no action has been taken to release the amount of compensation. The respondents are liable to pay the due compensation along with statutory interest from 2017 till the date of payment.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner is not entitled to the relief sought in the writ petition as her claim has already been rejected by the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Bokaro, by order dated 16.09.2025. He further submits that Khata No. 132, Plot No. 221 is recorded in the Khatiyan as Gair Mazurua Khas land with the nature of the land described as "Jungle", and therefore the petitioner has no right to claim compensation. He also submits that the petitioner has not filed documents to support her claim. He further submits that the amount of Rs.14,65,09,666/- was calculated as salami for 2 acres of land and is payable by CCL to the State Government through the Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro, and not to the petitioner.

6. After hearing the parties and perusal of the records, I find that petitioner's claim for compensation has already been considered and rejected by the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Bokaro, by order dated 16.09.2025. The petitioner has neither

challenged the said order in the present writ petition nor sought any relief for setting it aside. In the absence of any challenge to the said order, the petitioner cannot seek a direction for payment of compensation.

7. Further, the State is not accepting the petitioner to be the raiyat. The title of the land, as claimed by the petitioner is being disputed by the State. Further, in the opinion of this Court, giving employment to son of the petitioner, cannot be taken to be a conclusive proof of title of the petitioner over the land in question. Admittedly the records of rights of the land suggest that the same is a government land.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts of the case, I am of the view that the amount of Rs.14,65,09,666/- was calculated as salami payable by CCL to the State Government through the Deputy Commissioner and not as compensation payable to the petitioner. The petitioner has not produced any material or record to establish a legal right to receive the said amount or to rebut the respondents' stand. In the facts of the present case, the petitioner has failed to establish an enforceable legal right. If the petitioner wants to establish her title over the land she should approach the Civil Court.

9. Accordingly, the instant writ petition stands dismissed.

10. Pending I.A(s)., if any, stands disposed of.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

21st July, 2026
R.S./
Uploaded on 23/07/2026